arXiv:quant-ph/0407070v1 9 Jul 2004

Comment on Complex Extension of Quantum Mechanics

Ali Mostafazadeh*

Department of Mathematics, Koç University, 34450 Sariyer, Istanbul, Turkey

Abstract

In their Erratum [Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 119902 (2004), quant-ph/0208076], written in reaction to [quant-ph/0310164], Bender, Brody and Jones propose a revised definition for a physical observable in $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric quantum mechanics. We show that although this definition avoids the dynamical inconsistency revealed in quant-ph/0310164, it is still not a physically viable definition. In particular, we point out that a general proof that this definition is consistent with the requirements of the quantum measurement theory is lacking, give such a proof for a class of $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric systems by establishing the fact that this definition implies that the observables are pseudo-Hermitian operators, and show that for all the cases that this definition is consistent with the requirements of measurement theory it reduces to a special case of a more general definition given in [quant-ph/0310164]. The latter is the unique physically viable definition of observables in $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric quantum mechanics.

Bender, Brody and Jones [Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 119902 (2004), quant-ph/0208076] have recently proposed the following definition of a physical observable in $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric quantum mechanics. **Def. 1:** *A linear operator A is called an observable if it satisfies* [1]

$$A^T = \mathcal{CPT}\, A\, \mathcal{CPT}. \tag{1}$$

This definition avoids the incompatibility of their initial definition [2] with the dynamical aspects of the theory [3]. The purpose of this comment letter is to use the requirements of the quantum measurement theory to provide a critical assessment of the viability of Def. 1. In particular, we point out that (a) a general proof that Def. 1 is consistent with these requirements is lacking, (b) give such a proof for a class of $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric systems by establishing the fact that (1) implies that A is a pseudo-Hermitian operator [4], and (c) show that for all the cases that Def. 1 is consistent with these requirements it reduces to a more general definition [5],

*E-mail address: amostafazadeh@ku.edu.tr

namely **Def. 2:** *A linear operator A is called an observable if it is Hermitian with respect to the $\mathcal{CPT}$-inner product $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle$, i.e., $\langle\cdot|A\cdot\rangle = \langle A\cdot|\cdot\rangle$.*

Standard quantum measurement theory imposes the following conditions on any linear operator A that is to be identified with a physical observable. **(i)** the eigenvalues of A must be real; **(ii)** A has a complete set of eigenvectors that are mutually orthogonal with respect to the defining inner product $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle$ of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$.

It is a well-known result of linear algebra that (i) and (ii) are the necessary and sufficient conditions for the Hermiticity of an operator A, i.e., $\langle\cdot|A\cdot\rangle = \langle A\cdot|\cdot\rangle$. In $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric QM, $\langle\cdot|\cdot\rangle$ is the $\mathcal{CPT}$-inner product [2]. This shows that the most general definition that is compatible with (i) and (ii) is Def. 2. As a result, Def. 1 would be a physically viable definition, only if it turns out to be a special case of Def. 2. It is not equivalent to Def. 2, for it puts the additional restriction that the Hamiltonian H be not only $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric but also symmetric ($H^T = H$); it cannot for example be used to determine the observables for the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric system defined by the Hamiltonian $H = (p + ix)^2 + x^2$, [6].

Next, we note that one can use the identities $[\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{T}] = [\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{PT}] = 0$ and $\mathcal{C}^2 = \mathcal{P}^2 = 1$ to show that Eq. (1) implies

$$A^\dagger = \eta_+^{-1} A\, \eta_+, \tag{2}$$

where $A^\dagger = \mathcal{T} A^T \mathcal{T}$ is the usual adjoint of A and $\eta_+ := \mathcal{PC}$. Eq. (2) is the defining relation for a pseudo-Hermitian operator [4]. It is equivalent to the condition that A be Hermitian with respect to the inner product $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\eta_+} := (\cdot, \eta_+\cdot)$ where $(\cdot,\cdot)$ is the ordinary L^2-inner product. Therefore, Def. 1 implies that the observables A are Hermitian operators with respect to $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\eta_+}$, i.e., $\langle\cdot, A\cdot\rangle_{\eta_+} = \langle A\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\eta_+}$. For $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric theories defined on the real line, one can show by a direct computation [7] that $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle_{\eta_+}$ coincides with the $\mathcal{CPT}$-inner product. This proves that for these theories Def. 1 does indeed adhere to the requirements (i) and (ii) above. For $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric theories defined using a complex contour, such a proof is lacking.

This is a serious shortcoming. In effect it means that in order to employ Def. 1 one must not only establish the reality of the eigenvalues of an observable A but also prove that (1) implies the completeness of the eigenvectors of A and their orthogonality. Moreover, Def. 1 does not provide any practical means to construct the observables of the theories to which it applies. As argued in [5] the situation is different if one adopts Def. 2. One then would just compute the matrix elements $A_{mn} = \langle\phi_m|A\phi_n\rangle$ in the energy eigenbasis $\{\phi_n\}$ and check whether $A^*_{mn} = A_{nm}$.

In conclusion, there is no logical reason why one should adopt Def. 1 while there is already an alternative, namely Def. 2, that avoids all the above-mentioned problems. A conceptual consequence of adapting Def. 2 is that the only structural difference between conventional QM and $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric QM is that in the latter one defines the Hilbert space using the eigenvalue

problem of a differential operator. As explained in [5] the fact that there is (up to unitary equivalence) a single separable Hilbert space shows that this difference does not have any fundamental ramifications. This in turn suggests that the $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric QM should be viewed as a framework for dealing with phenomenological and effective theories.

* *

This work has been supported by the Turkish Academy of Sciences in the framework of the Young Researcher Award Program (EA-TÜBA-GEBİP/2001-1-1).

References

[1] According to [2], given a linear operator A represented by the infinite matrix $A(x, x')$ in the standard position representation, the traspose A^T of A is the operator that is represented by $A^T(x, x') := A(x', x)$. A is called symmetric if $A^T = A$.

[2] C. M. Bender, D. C. Brody and H. F. Jones, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 270401 (2002); See also ibid Am. J. Phys. **71**, 1095 (2003).

[3] This incompatibility was initially revealed in an attempt to construct the observables for a finite-dimensional toy model. It was then generally established in [5].

[4] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 205 (2002).

[5] A. Mostafazadeh, preprint: quant-ph/0310164.

[6] For other examples of nonsymmetric $\mathcal{PT}$-symmetric Hamiltonians see Eq. (15) of [2] and A. Mostafazadeh, J. Phys. A **36**, 7081 (2003).

[7] A. Mostafazadeh, J. Math. Phys. **44**, 974 (2003).